



OFFICIAL FILE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

July 3, 2000

Illinois Bell Telephone Company :  
: 00-0393  
Proposed implementation of High Frequency :  
Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service. :

## TO ALL PARTIES OF INTEREST:

The attached documents are served in accordance with 83 Ill. Adm. Code 200.710. They have been filed and included in the record of the case but shall not form the basis for any finding of fact in this proceeding.

Sincerely,

*Donna M. Caton*  
Donna M. Caton  
Chief Clerk

SC  
Hearing Examiner: Mr. Woods

cc: Mr. Phipps - Telecommunications

Theresa P Larkin  
Illinois Bell Telephone Company  
555 E. Cook St., Fl. 1E  
Springfield IL 62721. \*  
terryplarkin@ameritech.com

Cheryl Urbanksi Hamill  
AT&T Communications of Illinois, Inc.  
222 W. Adams St., Ste. 1500  
Chicago, IL 60606 \*  
chamill@att.com

Kenneth A. Schiffman  
Atty. for Sprint Communications L.P.  
8140 Ward Parkway, 5E  
Kansas City, MO 64114 \*  
mailto:kenneth.schiffman@mail.sprint.com

Carrie J. Hightman  
Latrice Kirkland  
Attys. For Rhythms Links, Inc.  
Schiff Hardin & Waite  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606 \*  
mailto:chightman@schiffhardin.com

Felicia Franco-Feinberg  
Covad Communications Company  
8700 W. Bryn Mawr, Ste. 800 South  
Chicago, IL 60631 \*  
mailto:ffranco@covad.com

# Memorandum

To: Donald Woods, Hearing Examiner

From: Commissioner Mary Frances Squires

Date: June 28, 2000

Subject: Questions for parties in Docket No. 00-0393.

---

I am concerned that SBC's Project Pronto initiative not have adverse impacts on the deployment of line sharing in Illinois. Therefore, in the interest of pursuing a successful deployment of advanced services and ensuring that this effort is not deterred, I request that the parties to Docket No. 00-0393 address the questions set forth in the attached document.

**Please have the parties address the following questions:**

1. What technical difficulties, if any, may be incurred by Ameritech in provisioning line sharing (or the High Frequency Portion of the Loop network element) in areas where Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier (or older generation DLC) is deployed.
2. What would resolve the limitations, if any, imposed by #1 above (i.e., sub-loop unbundling)? Please define all steps necessary to facilitate these solutions.
3. What impediments, if any, exist that would make implementing the solutions described in #2 above difficult? For example, assuming sub-loop unbundling could resolve some or all of the limitations, would Ameritech have the necessary space capacity in which to collocate DSLAM equipment to provision line sharing via sub-loop unbundling? Would Ameritech grant the competitive LECs the accessibility to their collocated DSLAM equipment needed to make sub-loop unbundling a viable solution?
4. Will interconnection requirements promote or deter line sharing via sub-loop unbundling (i.e., requiring the competitive LEC to interconnect at the remote terminal versus the serving area interface, or the competitive LEC being required to place transport facilities to the serving area interface)?
5. Should pricing be established for sub-loop line sharing arrangements?
6. Does Ameritech Illinois plan to offer "Broadband Service" (as provided by SBC to competitive LECs in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas), or a comparable service to competitive LECs in Illinois? If so, will this service be offered in addition to or in place of line sharing arrangements where DLC has been deployed?